

REMARKS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office action mailed Aug. 13, 2003, in which claims 2-5, 9, 13-16, 20, 24, 31, 35-52 are rejected. With this amendment, various of the claims are amended, no claims are added to the application, and no claims are canceled, leaving claims 1-52 in the application.

Objections to the claims

At paragraph 2 of the Office action, claims 1-52 are objected to for various informalities. With this amendment, the claims are changed as indicated in the Office action (except that where the Office action indicates a basis for objection to claims 19 and 37, it is believed that claims 17 and 36 respectively should have been indicated, and so claims 17 and 36 were changed instead).

Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

At paragraph 3 of the Office action, various of the claims are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. With this amendment, the claims are changed as indicated in the Office action (except that where the Office action indicates a basis for rejecting claim 21 the first time, and for rejecting claim 38, it is believed that claims 20 and 36 respectively should have been indicated, and so claims 20 and 36 were changed instead). Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of the claims under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At paragraph 5 of the Office action, claims 35, 41 and 47 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Schuchman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,577,066).


With this amendment, claims 35, 41 and 47 are amended to recite that the originally recited squaring or similar operation for providing a data-wiped signal is followed by a coherent processing of the data-wiped signal. Applicant respectfully submits that Schuchman et al. does not teach or suggest performing a coherent processing of a data-wiped signal, but instead teaches only performing a Fast Fourier Transform of such a signal. At page 16, first full paragraph, it is explained that the (second) coherent processing performed following the squaring or similar operation serves as a filter. As explained at page 15, the filtering is performed to increase the coherence length (the number of samples over which the effect of the data modulation is negligible) without downsampling and so keep the signal oversampled (relative to the sampling that would be required for the received signal) in anticipation of the code wipeoff, which, as explained below, has the effect of doubling the remnant carrier frequency. A FFT provides no such increase in coherence length.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 of claims 35, 41, and 47, all as amended here, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

Oct. 27, 2003
Date
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Retter, Reg. No. 41,266
tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955